



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/501,397	07/15/2004	Per Lindh	19378.0086	2359
7590	11/25/2008		EXAMINER	
Swilder Berlin Shreff Friedman Suite 300 3000 K Street NW Washington, DC 20007			XUE, BIN	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2163	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			11/25/2008	PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/501,397	LINDH ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	BELINDA XUE	2163	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 August 2008.  
 2a) This action is **FINAL**.                    2b) This action is non-final.  
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.  
 4a) Of the above claim(s) 15 and 16 is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
 6) Claim(s) 1-14, 17-20 is/are rejected.  
 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 15 July 2004 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
 a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:  
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)            | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .                                    |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>9/20/2004</u> .   | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ .                        |

**DETAILED ACTION**

1. Claims 1-20 are pending in this Office Action.
  
2. In responses to the restriction/election requirement sent out on 3/18/2008, applicant has elected group I with claims 1-14 and 17-20 for further consideration. Claims 15-16 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to displaying textual information on a graphical format, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made with traverse in the reply filed on 8/6/2008.

As a result, claims 1-14, 17-20 are pending in this Office Action.

**Oath/Declaration**

3. The applicant's oath/declaration has been reviewed by the examiner and is found to conform to the requirements prescribed in **37 C.F.R. 1.63**.

**Priority**

4. Acknowledgment is made of applicant's claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d). The certified copy has been filed in parent Application No. 0200108-9, filed on 1/16/2002.

**Information Disclosure Statement**

5. As required by **M.P.E.P. 609(C)**, the applicant's submissions of the Information Disclosure Statements dated September 4, 2004 is acknowledged by the examiner and the cited references have been considered in the examination of the claims now pending. As required by **M.P.E.P 609 C(2)**, a copy of the PTOL-1449 initialed and dated by the examiner is attached to the instant office action.

**Claim Objections**

6. Claims 1-14 and 17-20 are objected to because of the following informalities:

- Claim 18, an apparatus claim, refers to the “search engine claim 17.”  
Claim 17 describes a system, not an apparatus. Applicant might consider rewrite claim 18 as an independent claim.
- Claims 1-14 use bolded words “characterized by” and Claim 17-20 use bolded words “characterized in that.”
- Several numeric numbers are found in Claims 17-20 next to the terms. “(Q)” is found next to the word “query” in Claim 17.

- In Claims 17-19, “adapted to” is used. Language that suggests or makes optional but does not require steps to be performed or does not limit a claim to a particular structure does not limit the scope of a claim or claim limitation. The following are example of language:
  - (A) statements of intended use or field of use,
  - (B) "adapted to" or "adapted for" clauses,
  - (C ) “wherein” clauses, or
  - (D) “whereby” clauses.

This list of examples is not intended to be exhaustive. See also MPEP §2111.04.

Appropriate correction is required.

**Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101**

7. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

8. Claims 1-14, 17, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Art Unit: 2163

9. Claim 1 falls under the judicial exception of an abstract idea, which lacks a useful, concrete, and tangible result. A claimed series of steps or acts that do not result in a useful, concrete, and tangible result are not statutory within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. 101. In the instant case, the claims recite, “generating”, “receiving”, and “processing”. However, no useful, concrete and tangible result is claimed.

10. Claim 1, a method claim, claims 17 and 20, the system claims, do not contain any physical articles or object. The claims lack the necessary physical articles or objects to constitute a machine or a manufacture within the meaning of 35 USC 101. They are clearly not a series of steps or acts to be a process nor are they a combination of chemical compounds to be a composition of matter. As such, they fail to fall within a statutory category. They are, at best, functional descriptive material *per se*.

Descriptive material can be characterized as either “functional descriptive material” or “nonfunctional descriptive material.” Both types of “descriptive material” are nonstatutory when claimed as descriptive material *per se*, 33 F.3d at 1360, 31 USPQ2d at 1759. When functional descriptive material is recorded on some computer-readable medium, it becomes structurally and functionally interrelated to the medium and will be statutory in most cases since use of technology permits the function of the descriptive material to be realized. Compare *In re Lowry*, 32 F.3d 1579, 1583-84, 32 USPQ2d 1031, 1035 (Fed. Cir. 1994). Merely claiming nonfunctional descriptive material, i.e., abstract ideas, stored on a computer-readable medium, in a computer, or on an electromagnetic carrier signal, does not make it statutory. See *Diehr*, 450 U.S. at 185-

86, 209 USPQ at 8 (noting that the claims for an algorithm in *Benson* were unpatentable as abstract ideas because “[t]he sole practical application of the algorithm was in connection with the programming of a general purpose computer.”).

Claims 2-14 are the dependent claims of claim 1. They do not contain any physical article or object to overcome the rejection of claim 1.

**Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102**

11. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

12. **Claims 1, 4, 11-14, and 17-20** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Publication 2002/0022956 A1 of Ukrainczyk et al (“Ukrainczyk”).

As per **claim 1**, Ukrainianczyk discloses “a method of processing digitized textual information, the information being organized in terms, documents and document corpora, where each document contains at least one term and each document corpus contains at least one document, the method comprising:”

“generating a concept vector for each document in a document corpus, the concept vector conceptually classifying the contents of the document on a relatively compact format” as producing a feature vector for each document, wherein each feature vector includes the plurality of document features with a count corresponding to each document feature (page 2, paragraph [0012], lines 13-16), classifying a document into a category provided the category score exceeds a predetermined threshold (page 2, paragraph [0012], lines 22-24), and

“generating, for each term in the document corpus, a term-to-concept vector describing a relationship between the term” as associating a plurality of features with at least one category, wherein the plurality of features contribute to a decision to classify a document into said at least one category (page 2, paragraph [0013]), and “each of the concept vectors, characterized by the term-to-concept vectors being generated on basis of the concept vectors, and the method comprising:”

“receiving the term-to-concept vectors for the document corpus and on basis thereof generating a term-term matrix describing a term-to-term relationship between the terms in the document corpus” as during the model preparation phase, classification categories, document features (vocabulary) and evidence edits (the relationships between document features and classification categories) are specified. During the training phase, document feature statistics are gathered and relationships between features and classification categories are quantified. Next, in the topic spotting phase, these relationships are used to classify documents (paragraph [0029]). The matrix values are attributes of the relationship between features and concepts,

including feature frequency data determined by calculating the number of times the feature occurred in documents tagged to that concept node (count), and assigning a value representative of the strength of association between the feature and the concept (weight) (paragraph [0030]), and

“processing the term-term matrix into processed textual information” as updating the topic spotter matrix 90. Topic spotter matrix 90 is updated in the second stage of loading an evidential term by creating a row for the feature, indexed by the TermID (paragraph [0051]).

As per claim 4, Ukrainczyk teaches all the claimed subject matter as discussed above with respect to claim 1, Ukrainczyk further discloses “a method according to any one of the preceding claims, characterized by calculating a statistical co-occurrence value between each combination of two unique terms in the document corpus, the statistical co-occurrence value describing a dependent probability that a certain second term exists in a document provided that a certain first term exists in the document” as (paragraph [0070]), and “incorporating the statistical co-occurrence values into the term-term matrix to represent lexical relationships between the terms in the document corpus” (paragraph [0029]).

As per claim 11, Ukrainczyk teaches all the claimed subject matter as discussed above with respect to claim 1, Ukrainczyk further discloses “a method according to any one of the claims 9 or 10, characterized by displaying the processed textual information

as a distance graph in which each term constitutes a node, a node representing a first term is connected to one or more other nodes representing secondary terms to which the first term has a conceptual relationship of at least a specific strength” as (paragraph [0029] – [0030]), and “the relevance measure between the first term and the at least one second term is represented by a minimum number of node hops between the first term and the at least one second term” as (paragraph [0030]).

As per **claim 12**, Ukrainczyk teaches all the claimed subject matter as discussed above with respect to claim 1, Ukrainczyk further discloses “a method according to any one of the claims 9 or 10, characterized by displaying the processed textual information as a distance graph in which each term constitutes a node, a node representing a first term is connected to one or more other nodes representing secondary terms to which the first term has a conceptual relationship” as (paragraph [0102]), “each connection is associated with an edge weight representing the strength of a conceptual relationship between the first term and a particular secondary term” as (paragraph [0103]), and “the relevance measure between the first term and a particular secondary term is represented by an accumulation of the edge weights being associated with the connections constituting a minimum number node hops between the first term and the particular secondary term” as (paragraph [0036], paragraph [0030]).

As per **claim 13**, Ukrainczyk teaches all the claimed subject matter as discussed above with respect to claim 1, Ukrainczyk further discloses “a method according to any

one of the preceding claims, characterized by each term representing one of: a single word, a proper name, a phrase, and a compound of single words” as (paragraph [0009]).

As per **claim 14**, Ukrainczyk teaches all the claimed subject matter as discussed above with respect to claim 1, Ukrainczyk further discloses “a method according to any one of the preceding claims, characterized by updating the document corpus with added data in form of at least one new document by means of: identifying any added terms in the new document which lack a representation in the document corpus” as (paragraph [0047]), “identifying any existing terms in the new document which were represented in the document corpus before adding the at least one new document” as (paragraph [0025]), “retrieving, for each of the existing terms, a corresponding concept vector” as (paragraph [0059]), “generating a new concept vector with respect to the at least one new document as a sum of the corresponding concept vectors” as (paragraph [0036]), “normalizing the new concept vector into a normalized new concept vector” as (paragraph [0070]), and “assigning the normalized new concept vector to each of the added terms in the new document” as (paragraph [0082]).

As per **claim 17**, Ukrainczyk discloses “a search engine (115) for processing an amount of digitized textual information and extracting data there from, the information being organized in terms, documents and document corpora, where each document

Art Unit: 2163

contains at least one term and each document corpus contains at least one document, comprising:

“an interface (116) adapted to receive a query (Q) from a user” as a user inputting a query at a terminal (page 7, paragraph [0067], lines 8-9), and “a processing unit (150) adapted to process a document corpus on basis of the query (Q) and return processed textual information (R) being relevant to the query (Q), said process involving generating a concept vector for each document in the document corpus, the concept vector conceptually classifying the contents of the document on a relatively compact format” as a central processing unit (CPU) (paragraph [0024]), producing a feature vector for each document, wherein each feature vector includes the plurality of document features with a count corresponding to each document feature (page 2, paragraph [0012], lines 13-16), classifying a document into a category provided the category score exceeds a predetermined threshold (page 2, paragraph [0012], lines 22-24), and

“generating, for each term in the document corpus, a term-to-concept vector describing a relationship between the term and each of the concept vectors” as associating a plurality of features with at least one category, wherein the plurality of features contribute to a decision to classify a document into said at least one category (page 2, paragraph [0013]), “characterized in that the processing unit (150) in turn comprises:

“a processing module (151) adapted to receive the term-to-concept vectors for the document corpus and on basis thereof generate a term-term matrix describing a

term-to-term relationship between the terms in the document corpus” as during the model preparation phase, classification categories, document features (vocabulary) and evidence edits (the relationships between document features and classification categories) are specified. During the training phase, document feature statistics are gathered and relationships between features and classification categories are quantified. Next, in the topic spotting phase, these relationships are used to classify documents (paragraph [0029]). The matrix values are attributes of the relationship between features and concepts, including feature frequency data determined by calculating the number of times the feature occurred in documents tagged to that concept node (count), and assigning a value representative of the strength of association between the feature and the concept (weight) (paragraph [0030]), and “an exploring module (152) adapted to receive the query (Q) and the term-term matrix, and on basis of the query (Q), process the term-term matrix into the processed textual information (R)” as updating the topic spotter matrix 90. Topic spotter matrix 90 is updated in the second stage of loading an evidential term by creating a row for the feature, indexed by the TermID (paragraph [0051]).

As per **claim 18**, Ukrainczyk discloses “a database (130) holding an amount of digitized textual information being organized in terms, documents and document corpora” as term is added to symbol table 70 (paragraph [0047]), assign a document to a particular concept node (paragraph [0054], all documents are being classified into feature vectors (paragraph [0070]),

“where each document contains at least one term and each document corpus contains at least one document” as Term list 20 is a user-inputted list of words and phrases denoting entities of various types (organization names, technical terms, etc.) These are document features that may be useful in categorizing the documents. They are eventually entered into symbol table 70 and, feature table 80 (paragraph [0029], lines 35-39),

“each document in a document corpus being associated with concept vector which conceptually classifies the contents of the document on a relatively compact format” as documents have been classified into feature vectors 100 and the topic spotter matrix 90 has been updated with all the feature vectors 100 (paragraph [0070]), and

“each term in the document corpus being associated with a term-to-concept vector describing a relationship between the term and each of the concept vectors, characterized in that it is adapted to deliver the term-to-concept vectors to a search engine (115) according to the claim 17” as the matrix values are attributes of the relationship between features and concepts, including feature frequency data determined by calculating the number of times the feature occurred in documents tagged to that concept node (count), and assigning a value representative of the strength of association between the feature and the concept (weight). At the conclusion of the training phase, topic spotter matrix 90 is comprised of a combination of automatically generated data and manually inputted concept evidence vectors from REE Table 50 (paragraph [0030]).

As per **claim 19**, Ukrainczyk teaches all the claimed subject matter as discussed above with respect to claim 18, Ukrainczyk further discloses “a database (130) according to claim 18, characterized in that it comprises an iterative term-to-concept engine adapted to receive fresh digitized textual information added to the database (13.0)” as symbol table 70 and, feature table 80. In one embodiment, term list 20 includes vocabulary, synonyms, etc (paragraph [0029], lines 24-26)"and on basis of this information:"

“generate concept vectors for any added document” as producing a feature vector for each document, wherein each feature vector includes the plurality of document features with a count corresponding to each document feature (page 2, paragraph [0012], lines 13-16); All terms found by feature identifier 40 are added to symbol table 70 and feature table 80 (paragraph [0029], lines 46-47), and “generate a term-to-concept vector describing a relationship between any added term and each of the concept vectors” as associating a plurality of features with at least one category, wherein the plurality of features contribute to a decision to classify a document into said at least one category (page 2, paragraph [0013]).

As per **claim 20**, Ukrainczyk discloses “a server (110) for providing data processing services in respect of digitized textual information, characterized in that it comprises:” as

“a search engine (115) according to claim 17” as the system can retrieve information utilizing Boolean keyword searching (paragraph [0007]) , and “a communication interface (112) towards a database (130) according to any one of the claims 18 or 19” as user can input text. The input text can be copied to the database (paragraph [0067]).

**Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103**

13. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

14. **Claim 2** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Publication 2002/0022956 A1 of Ukrainczyk in view of U.S. Publication 2003/0050921 A1 of Tokuda et al (“Tokuda”).

As per **claim 2**, Ukrainczyk teaches all the claimed subject matter as discussed above with respect to claim 1, Ukrainczyk further discloses “characterized by each document in the document corpus being associated with a document-concept matrix representing at least one concept element whose relevance with respect to the document is described by a weight factor, the generation of each term-to-concept

vector comprising:"

"identifying a term-relevant set of documents in the document corpus, each document in the term-relevant set containing at least one occurrence of the term" as (page 6, paragraph [0066]),

"calculating a term weight for the term in each of the documents in the term-relevant set" as (page 7, paragraph [0069]),

"retrieving a respective concept vector being associated with each document in the term-relevant set where the term weight exceeds a first threshold value" as (page 8, paragraph [0072], paragraph [0075]),

"selecting a relevant set of concept vectors including any concept vector in which at least one concept component exceeds a second threshold value" as (paragraph [0075]),

"calculating a non-normalized term-to-concept vector as the sum of all concept vectors in the relevant set" as (paragraph [0070]).

However, Ukrainczyk does not explicitly disclose "normalizing the non-normalized term-to-concept vector."

Tokuda discloses this limitation as the document vectors of all the collected documents are then set up and normalized (paragraph [0052]).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Tokuda's teaching of normalizing document vectors into Ukrainczyk's system in order to represent data at its original resolution and form without generalization.

15. **Claims 3 and 5-10** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Publication 2002/0022956 A1 of Ukrainczyk in view of U.S. Patent 7,194,483 B1 issued to Mohan et al (“Mohan”).

As per claim 3, Ukrainczyk teaches all the claimed subject matter as discussed above with respect to claim 1, Ukrainczyk further disclose “a method according to any one of the preceding claims, characterized by the generation of the term-term matrix comprising:”

“retrieving, for each term in each combination of two unique terms in the document corpus, a respective term-to-concept vector” as (paragraphs [0074] – [0075]),

“generating a relation vector describing the relationship between the terms in each combination of two unique terms” as (paragraph [0029]),

“generating a matrix containing the relationship values of all combinations of two unique terms in the document corpus” as (Fig. 1 and corresponding paragraphs).

However, Ukrainczyk does not explicitly disclose “each component in the relation vector being equal to a lowest component value of corresponding component values in the term-to-concept vectors” and “generating a relationship value for each combination of two unique terms as the sum of all component values in the corresponding relation vector.”

Mohan discloses “each component in the relation vector being equal to a lowest component value of corresponding component values in the term-to-concept vectors” as verb be given lowest weightage (column 11, line 38), and “generating a relationship value for each combination of two unique terms as the sum of all component values in the corresponding relation vector” as combined score R of all key concepts appearing in the category and the object are summed (column 17, lines 23-26).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Mohan’s teaching of sum the objects into Ukrainczyk’s system in order to give weight on each category for importance.

As per claim 5, Ukrainczyk teaches all the claimed subject matter as discussed above with respect to claim 1. However, Ukrainczyk does not explicitly disclose “a method according to any one of the preceding claims, characterized by displaying the processed textual information on a format being adapted for human comprehension.”

Mohan discloses the above limitation in Fig. 13 and its correspondent paragraphs.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Mohan’s teaching of displaying formatted information into Ukrainczyk’s system in order to be viewed by user easily.

As per claim 6, Ukrainczyk teaches all the claimed subject matter as discussed above with respect to claim 1. However, Ukrainczyk does not explicitly disclose “a

method according to claim 5, characterized by the displaying step involving presentation of at least one of: at least one document identifier specifying a document being relevant with respect at least one term in a query, at least one term being related to a term in a query, and a conceptual distribution representing a conceptual relationship between two or more terms in the document corpus, the conceptual distribution being based on shared concepts which are common to said terms.”

Mohan discloses the above limitation as score of 14 for business concept (column 22, lines 21-27).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Mohan’s teaching of displaying formatted information into Ukrainczyk’s system in order to be viewed by user easily.

As per claim 7, Ukrainczyk teaches all the claimed subject matter as discussed above with respect to claim 1. However, Ukrainczyk does not explicitly disclose “a method according to claim 6, characterized by the displaying step involving presentation of at least one document identifier specifying a document being relevant with respect to at least one term in a query in combination with at least one user specified concept.”

Mohan discloses the above limitation at column 20, lines 1-25.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Mohan’s teaching of displaying formatted information into Ukrainczyk’s system in order to be viewed by user easily.

As per claim 8, Ukrainczyk teaches all the claimed subject matter as discussed above with respect to claim 1. However, Ukrainczyk does not explicitly disclose “a method according to claim 7, characterized by selecting the at least one user specified concept from the shared concepts in the conceptual distribution.”

Mohan discloses this limitation at column 20, lines 1-25.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Mohan’s teaching of selecting concept from user into Ukrainczyk’s system in order to provide information more accurate to the user.

As per claim 9, Ukrainczyk teaches all the claimed subject matter as discussed above with respect to claim 1. However, Ukrainczyk does not explicitly disclose “a method according to any one of the claims 5 - 8, characterized by illustrating the conceptual relationship between a first term and at least one second term by means of a respective relevance measure being associated with the at least one second term in respect of the first term.”

Mohan discloses this limitation at column 14, lines 1-23).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Mohan’s teaching of providing measurement into Ukrainczyk’s system in order to provide information more accurate to the user.

As per claim 10, Ukrainczyk teaches all the claimed subject matter as discussed above with respect to claim 1. However, Ukrainczyk does not explicitly disclose “a

Art Unit: 2163

method according to claim 9, characterized by displaying the processed textual information on a graphical format which visualizes the strength in the conceptual relationship between at least two terms."

Mohan discloses an innovation trends in Fig. 16 and Fig. 10.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Mohan's teaching of using graphical displaying technique into Ukrainczyk's system in order to be viewed by user easily.

### Conclusion

16. The examiner requests, in response to this Office action, support being shown for language added to any original claims on amendment and any new claims. That is, indicate support for newly added claim language by specifically pointing to page(s) and line no(s) in the specification and/or drawing figure(s). This will assist the examiner in prosecuting the application.

17. When responding to this office action, Applicant is advised to clearly point out the patentable novelty which he or she thinks the claims present, in view of the state of the art disclosed by the references cited or the objections made. He or she must also show how the amendments avoid such references or objections See 37 CFR 1.111(c).

**Contact Information**

18. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Belinda Xue whose telephone number is 571-270-1762. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 8:00 am-4:30 pm EST.

19. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Don Wong can be reached on 571-272-1834. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

November 21, 2008  
/Cam Y Truong/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2169

Belinda Xue  
/B. X./  
Examiner, Art Unit 2163